

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4

Agenda

Senator Mark DeSaulnier, Chair
Senator Tom Harman
Senator Gloria Negrete McLeod
Senator Roderick Wright



Thursday, May 14, 2009
9:30 a.m. or Upon Adjournment
Room 112

Consultants: Bryan Ehlers, Brian Annis, & Amy Supinger

Open Issues

“A” Agenda

<u>Item Number and Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Proposed Vote-Only Calendar</i>	
0911 Citizens Redistricting Initiative (Voters FIRST ACT—Prop 11).....	2
1100 African American Museum	2
1111 Department of Consumer Affairs	2
<i>Discussion Items</i>	
0502 Office of the State Chief Information Officer	3
0520 Secretary for Business, Transportation, and Housing	5
0957/2240 California Pollution Control Financing Authority / Department of Housing and Community Development —CALReUSE	7
2240 Department of Housing and Community Development.....	10
2320 Department of Real Estate	14
<i>Appendix</i>	
A Employee Housing Program Scenarios.....	15

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals who, because of a disability, need special assistance to attend or participate in a Senate Committee hearing, or in connection with other Senate services, may request assistance at the Senate Rules Committee, 1020 N Street, Suite 255 or by calling 916-324-9335. Requests should be made one week in advance whenever possible.

Items Proposed for Consent / Vote-Only

(See Consolidated Vote-Only Recommendation on page 2.)

1. April Finance Letter (FL): Fund Citizens Redistricting Initiative (Item 0911-001-0001; Issue 059). Consistent with the requirements of the “Voters FIRST Act” (Proposition 11), the Governor requests \$3 million General Fund (GF) to support the efforts of the Citizens Redistricting Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Bureau of State Audits in carrying out their responsibilities as defined in the initiative. Per the requirements of Proposition 11, this appropriation would be available for three years.

Staff Comments. Due to revenue collections that have fallen well below projections (at least \$2 billion) thus far in the fiscal year, the GF is not in a good position to support additional expenditures. However, Proposition 11 requires the Legislature to approve at least \$3 million GF to support the Citizens Redistricting Initiative. Therefore, the Legislature has little choice but to approve this request.

2. April Finance Letter (Item 1100-001-0267; Issue 201). Increase item by \$293,000 one-time from the Exposition Park Improvement Fund to provide additional funds for maintenance, repair and equipment at the African American Museum.

3. April Finance Letter (Item 1111-002-0582; Issue 202). Decrease Department of Consumer Affairs item by a net of \$2,000,000 to reflect the reduced usage of vehicle retirement fund (-\$3,975,000) and the increased usage of the vehicle repair assistance program (\$1,975,000).

4. April Finance Letter (Item 1111-002-3122; Issue 201). Add new Department of Consumer Affairs item to establish the Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program (beginning April 1, 2010). Program is funded using special fund dollars and provides for off-cycle vehicle retirement and the issuance of vouchers for vehicle replacement.

Consolidated Staff Recommendation: APPROVE Vote-Only Items 1-4 above.

VOTE:

Items Proposed for Discussion

0502 Office of the State Chief Information Officer

The Office of the State Chief Information Officer (OCIO) establishes and enforces statewide information technology strategic plans, policies, standards, and enterprise architecture, and provides review and oversight of information technology projects for all state departments.

The OCIO was created under Chapter 183, Statutes of 2007 (SB 90—Budget Trailer Bill). The 2009-10 Governor's Budget proposed \$16.1 million (\$10 million GF) and 68 positions for the department—an increase of \$9.4 million (\$5.8 million GF) and 34 positions. However, the Legislature withheld without prejudice \$8.6 million (\$5.8 million GF) and 34 positions from the 2009-10 budget bill adopted in February 2009.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. BCP-1: Augment OCIO. The 2009-10 Governor's Budget proposed \$6.4 million (\$3.7 million GF) and 33 positions to staff newly created offices within the OCIO, including Legislative Affairs, Enterprise Architecture, Human Capital, Geospatial Services, and Project Management.

2009-10 Enacted Budget. Provides zero funding or position authority for this request.

Staff Comments. The requested resources were withheld without prejudice from the 2009-10 budget bill enacted in February 2009, and the Administration now indicates that most of the functions for which these positions were proposed will be carried out by staff formerly housed within the Department of Technology Services (which was recently consolidated under the OCIO pursuant to the Governor's Reorganization Plan No. 1). However, six of the positions requested have already been administratively established and funded from within existing resources, and the OCIO is requesting the Legislature to grant permanent position authority (and no additional funding). Staff has no concerns with the Administration's alternative proposal at this time.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE the requested authority for six permanent positions (one Chief of Staff, one Data Processing Manager IV, one Data Processing Manager II, two Administrative Assistant IIs, and one Office Tech Typing).

VOTE:

2. BCP-2: Implement SB 1298—Linked Education Data Systems. The 2009-10 Governor's Budget proposed \$2 million GF and one position to implement provisions of Chapter 561, Statutes of 2008 (SB 1298, Simitian) that require the OCIO to: (1) convene a working group to create a strategic plan that, among other things, provides an overall structural design for the linked education data system and examines the protocols and procedures to be used by state agencies in data processing; (2)

deliver the strategic plan to the Legislature and the Governor by no later than September 1, 2009; and (3) form an advisory committee to the working group.

2009-10 Enacted Budget. Provides zero funding or position authority for this request.

Staff Comments. In light of the current fiscal crisis, and notwithstanding the intent of the Legislature in passing SB 1298, the GF is unable to support additional non-essential expenditures at this time. Therefore, staff recommends this proposal receive further consideration by the Subcommittee only in the event that the Administration can identify an alternative funding source.

Staff Recommendation: NO ACTION.

0520 Secretary for Business, Transportation and Housing

The Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency (BT&H Agency) is a member of the Governor's Cabinet and oversees 16 departments. In addition, the Secretary's Office oversees programs, including the Film Commission, which are budgeted directly in the Secretary's Office.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

1. FL-1: California Film Commission—Staffing for new tax credit. The Administration requests an augmentation of \$644,000 General Fund (GF) and 5.0 positions (1.0 limited term) to administer the new film tax credit program created by SB 15XXX. The new film credit is a five-year program with credits capped at \$100 million per year and is intended to retain film production in California and attract new film work to the state. Ten percent of the credits are reserved for independent films. The California Film Commission (CFC) will: (1) adopt regulations; (2) award credit allocations to qualifying productions; and (3) issue a credit certificate to the qualifying taxpayer at the end of production. Taxpayers would then use their credits on their tax return filed with the Franchise Tax Board (FTB).

Revised Administration Request. Since release of the April Finance Letter, the Film Commission has worked with the LAO and legislative staff to refine their proposal. After reexamining the funding need, the Administration now believes it could successfully implement the program with \$417,000 GF and 3.5 positions (0.5 limited term) – this would be a reduction of \$227,000 from the original proposal. The savings is both related to position savings and a lower estimate of information technology costs.

April 23, 2009, Subcommittee #4 Hearing. This issue was heard in Subcommittee #4 on April 23, 2009, and the issues was held open. The Subcommittee requested that the Film Commission continue to work with LAO and staff on funding justification, reporting, etc.

April 27, 2009, Assembly Budget Action. This issue was heard in Assembly Budget Subcommittee #4 on April 27, 2009, and that Subcommittee adopted the revised administration request plus additional reductions. The additional reductions were: (1) a reduction in 2009-10 funding for the staff services analyst by half since workload begins primarily when production companies submit their receipts for verification by commission when productions are completed – this position would be funded ongoing starting in the second half of the fiscal year; and (2) a reduction in outreach funding for the credit by half from \$50,000 to \$25,000 in 09-10 – by the passage of the budget, the first round of credit reservations will have already have been granted and there will only be a need to ramp-up outreach for the FY 10-11 grant process.

Additional Information from the Film Commission. As requested at the prior hearing, the Film Commission has provided additional data on film production in California and other states. To evaluate the success of the new credit program, the implementing legislation requires a report as follows:

(a) On or before December 31, 2015, the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency shall report to the Legislature on the economic impact of the tax incentives created by Sections 6902.5, 17053.85 and 23685 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, as added by this act. In preparing the report, the agency shall consider, but is not limited to considering, all of the following:

- (1) The number and increase or decrease of qualified motion pictures produced in California.
- (2) The amount of total qualified wages paid or incurred in California.
- (3) The level of employment in the production industry in California.

(b) The agency may consult with the Employment Development Department, the Franchise Tax Board, the State Board of Equalization, representatives of industry and labor organizations, and agencies of local government before completing its report.

Staff Comments. While the new \$500 million multi-year film tax credit will create a new workload for the Film Commission, it is a GF entity and cost must be kept to the bare minimum. The Assembly action appears to minimize costs but still retain for the Film Commission sufficient resources for successful implementation.

Staff Recommendation: Conform to the Assembly Action. (This action would provide about half the original \$644,000 GF request.)

VOTE:

0957 California Pollution Control Financing Authority / 2240 Department of Housing and Community Development

The state Treasurer chairs a number of financing authorities, including the California Pollution Control Financing Authority (CPCFA), which acts as a “conduit issuer” of tax-exempt private activity bonds, in order to facilitate low cost financing to qualified waste and recycling projects.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) administers housing finance, economic development, and rehabilitation programs, and generally administers the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006 (Prop 1C).

DISCUSSION ITEM:

1. Informational Item: California Recycle Underutilized Sites (CALReUSE) Remediation Program. The Subcommittee has been made aware of a request by the CPCFA for \$60 million from Prop 1C Infill Incentive Grant Program (IIG) funds.

CALReUSE. The CALReUSE Program assists with the reuse and redevelopment of underutilized properties with real or perceived hazardous material contamination issues—brownfields. CALReUSE has two components. The Assessment Program provides forgivable loans to assist with brownfield site assessments. The Remediation Program provides both grants and loans to lean up brownfields that will be redeveloped into mixed-use and residential developments.

Projects currently seeking CALReUSE financing include, among others, the Railyards (Sacramento), Hunters Point (San Francisco), Napa Pipe (Napa), and Boulevards at South Bay (Carson).

The Prop 1C funds would come from \$850 million provided in that bond act in the Regional Planning, Housing, and Infill Incentive Account, subject to legislative appropriation and any criteria or conditions established by the Legislature in statute. Uses of the account may include "brownfield cleanup that promotes infill housing development and other related infill development consistent with regional and local plans."

Staff Comments.

- 1) The Legislature provided \$60 million of Prop. 1C funds for CALReUSE in 2007. An additional \$60 million was included in AB 7 X1, a bill amending the 2008 Budget Act, passed by the Legislature in December 2008, but vetoed by the Governor.
- 2) In February 2009, the Legislature adopted the Governor's proposal to appropriate \$190 million in local assistance and \$2.6 million in state operations for the IIG. The HCD indicates that the \$190 million contained in the enacted 2009-10 budget represents all of the non-committed funds remaining in the Prop 1C Infill Incentive Account. Although award allocations through the budget

year total only \$790 million of the original \$850 bond authority for the Infill program, the remaining \$60 million is required to cover administrative costs (including the Treasurer's and the Pooled Money Investment Board's costs) and long-term monitoring of the program (e.g., ensuring the affordability of units for up to 55 years).

3) The CPCFA notes the following with respect to CALReUSE:

- There is an identified need of \$152 million for projects (awarded and in the pipeline). Initially, CPCFA received 32 applications for projects requesting nearly \$82 million in funding. After these initial projects were awarded [using the \$60 million provided in 2007-08], there remains a known demand of an additional \$98 million worth of eligible projects that are ready to commence construction in 2009.
- The initial \$60 million [allocated in 2007-08] will:
 - Assist in the creation of approximately 35,000 permanent jobs, 80,000 cleanup and construction jobs, and a minimum of 3,000 jobs indirectly with an overall economic impact of well over \$33 billion; and
 - Leverage tremendous private investment expected to exceed \$7.6 billion (combined public/private investment to exceed \$9.9 billion) to construct hundreds of acres of infill development.
- CALReUSE funding will assist in the creation of over 7,800 housing units directly and an additional 24,000 housing units indirectly. Of the 32 funded projects, 30 contain affordable housing.
- The Program makes efficient use of state money with an average per unit housing cost of \$6,845 in CALReUSE dollars.

4) The HCD notes the following regarding the potential diversion of \$60 million from the current Infill allocation:

Diverting funds to CalReUSE would directly reduce funds for infill housing development under the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program. On January 30, 2009, HCD released the \$197 million NOFA [Notice of Funding Availability] for the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program. We have received about three times that dollar amount in funding requests. Clearly, there are a significant number of projects throughout the state that could [use the money], through the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program should the funding be made available to that program. While it is appropriate to mitigate past environmental damage, the use of the limited housing funding should be prioritized for programs that provide housing unit development as directly and efficiently as possible.

Committee Questions. Based on the above, the Subcommittee may wish to ask some or all of the following questions:

- Is the CPCFA seeking a redirection of funds already appropriated to HCD (in other words, a \$60 million carve out of the \$190 million currently contained in the 2009-10 budget bill adopted in February), or is the CPCFA seeking the Legislature to commit Infill dollars that would otherwise be used to protect the affordability of Prop 1C-funded housing? If the latter, then how does the

CPCFA propose the state protect its multi-million dollar investment in affordable housing?

- Can the CPCFA demonstrate that the marginal Infill dollar spent on CALReUSE projects produces more benefit (e.g., more, and more affordable, housing) than the alternative use in the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program?
- The HCD currently has a Notice of Funding Availability on the street for \$197 million, and has identified three times that amount in project applicants. How quickly could the CPCFA disburse awards?
- Are there any federal stimulus monies available to the CALReUse Program?

Staff Recommendation: NO ACTION—informational only.

2240 Department of Housing and Community Development

A primary objective of the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is to expand housing opportunities for all Californians. The Department administers housing finance, economic development, and rehabilitation programs with emphasis on meeting the shelter needs of low-income persons and families, and other special needs groups. It also administers and implements building codes, manages mobilehome registration and titling, and enforces construction standards for mobilehomes.

The Governor proposes \$803.3 million (\$9.4 million GF) and 595.3 positions for the department—a decrease of \$340 million (30 percent) and an increase of 1.5 positions.

The majority of the HCD's expenditures are supported by general obligation bond revenue. The budget includes approximately \$548 million (excluding administrative costs) in funding from the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006 (Prop 1C)—a decrease of approximately \$180 million from 2008-09 due to the pending exhaustion of the bond funds. The HCD also continues to transfer positions funded from the Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2002 (Prop 46) to Prop 1C activities as all remaining funds available under Prop 46 are projected to be awarded by the end of the current fiscal year.

The second largest revenue source is federal funds, estimated at \$178 million in 2009-10, which is about \$139 million less than 2008-09, when California received \$140 million for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program under the American Housing Rescue and Foreclosure Prevention Act of 2008 (HR 3221). Remaining expenditures of about \$77 million are covered by the GF (\$9.4 million), fees, and other miscellaneous revenues.

VOTE-ONLY ITEM:

FL-1: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The HCD estimates the state may be eligible to receive various ARRA funding on a one-time basis only, and requests an augmentation in federal expenditure authority of \$129 million in local assistance for fiscal year 2009-10. The funding would be allocated as follows:

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| • Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) | \$10.7 million |
| • Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP)
via the Federal Emergency Shelter Grant (FESG) | \$44.5 million |
| • Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) | \$74.0 million |

The HCD notes that California will have to compete for NSP funding; therefore, the \$74 million is an estimate only.

Staff Comments. This item was heard previously on April 23, 2009, and held open in order to allow time for the federal government to release guidelines for the NSP. Based on those guidelines, the HCD does not anticipate the need to substantially alter the request described in this finance letter.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE as budgeted.

VOTE:

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. BCP-5: Employee Housing Program. The Governor requests a suspension of the HCD's responsibilities under the Employee Housing Act by eliminating all remaining funding (\$231,000 in reimbursements supported by fee revenue) and positions (9). Additionally, the Administration proposes trailer bill language (TBL) to suspend the HCD's administrative and enforcement responsibilities when, in any given year, the department is not funded for the responsibility.

2009-10 Enacted Budget. Restored the \$231,000 reimbursement authority deleted in the Governor's Budget and did not implement the Governor's requested statutory changes.

Staff Comments. This item was heard previously on April 23, 2009, and held open due to concern that the Governor's proposal—for the HCD to abandon inspections of employee housing—could place the health and safety of employee housing residents at risk if local governments fail to voluntarily assume responsibility for the inspections. As previously noted, if the Subcommittee wishes to ensure some minimum level of inspections occurs, there are two primary options:

1. Require local governments to conduct the inspections using the fee authority provided in existing statute to support their efforts (the LAO recommendation); or
2. Increase state fee limits in order to generate enough revenue for the HCD to continue a credible program of inspections.

Staff notes that Option #1 would eliminate the need for the state to maintain an inspection presence throughout the state, and would instead place the responsibility within the affected communities. However, staff notes that returning inspection responsibilities to the locals, whether mandated or not, raises at least two concerns. First, most local governments do not have the same level of experience as the HCD in carrying out this program; and, second, local governments could come under significant political pressure to maintain a less than aggressive oversight of employee housing. Either way, the HCD would no longer be in the business of monitoring the locals who run their own inspection programs (as is currently the case). The excerpt below, taken from the HCD's Employee Housing Program 2007 Statistical Summary, provides an example of the types of deficiencies that could go overlooked if the state pulls back from this responsibility:

Tulare County Resource Management Agency program received an "improvement needed" with substantial deficiencies observed.

Deficiencies noted:

- *Applications for Permits to Operate had no dates to confirm when the renewal forms were sent.*
- *Records do not account for numerous missing, but paid for, Permits to Operate, nor do they show if these facilities were inspected.*

- *Only two out of 28 facilities found to be operating without a permit were inspected.*
- *As a result of the low number of violations cited compared to the number of older facilities, it was recommended that additional monitoring and training be conducted to insure compliance with applicable Sections of the Health & Safety Code.*

The Subcommittee could opt to maintain a state fee (on top of a local fee) for the purpose of continuing state oversight of local enforcement agencies. Or, rather than maintaining two separate fee structures to provide statewide “overseers for the overseers,” the Subcommittee might simply wish to consider raising fees to maintain a lean, but credible enforcement capability at the HCD.

Based on the Subcommittee’s request for technical assistance on how to maintain a state-run inspection program, the HCD has provided the menu of fee options contained in Appendix A. The inspection levels reflected are based on 447 facilities statewide, and 14,160 beds/lots, and assume that the HCD would respond to all complaints and continue to issue all permits to operate. The following is provided for frame of reference:

- The first row in Appendix A reflects current service levels (inspections of approximately 75 percent of all housing, and employer fees (a flat \$35 permit-to-operate fee and \$12 per employee (bed)). These fees were last adjusted over two decades ago.
- Adjusting the existing fee levels by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for 20 to 30 years, produces the following estimated fee ranges:

	Current	CPI-Adjusted Range
Permit-to-Operate Fee	\$35	\$55 - \$75
Per-Employee Fee	\$12	\$20 - \$30

- Among locals who currently conduct their own inspections, five counties charge the same per-employee fee as the state (\$12), with the highest fee at \$20. Meanwhile, four counties charge the same permit-to-operate fee as the state (\$35), three are under \$50, and only Monterey (\$77), Tulare (\$200) and Santa Cruz (\$362) are significantly above the HCD fee level.

Staff notes that HCD staff were unable to assess the ability of employers to pay various fee levels (i.e., identify a level that would constitute a burden), so staff suggests that, if it wishes to keep a lean but credible state inspection program, the Subcommittee should work between the above frames of reference and the menu of options in Appendix A to identify a reasonable fee level that meets its policy goals.

Staff Recommendation: Adopt placeholder trailer bill language to increase the permit-to-operate fee to \$200 (similar to Tulare County) and the per-employee fee to \$27 (consistent with the range of CPI-adjusted estimates above) in order to allow the HCD to maintain oversight of local enforcement agencies and complete inspections of at least 25 percent of the highest priority employee housing.

VOTE:

2. BCP-7: Codes and Standards Fee Increase – Mobilehome Parks. The Governor proposes the following changes to the HCD's Codes and Standards Program (including trailer bill language—TBL) in order to address a steady decline in revenues from several sources over the past several years:

- Increase the registration fee for manufactured housing, mobilehomes, and commercial modulars from \$11 to \$23;
- Increase the permit-to-operate fee for mobilehome parks from \$25 to \$140;
- Increase the per-lot fee in mobilehome parks from \$2 to \$7;
- Provide a \$2.1 million loan from the Mobilehome Park Purchase Fund (Purchase Fund) to the Mobilehome-Manufactured Home Revolving Fund (Mobilehome Fund);
- Reduce programs supported by the Mobilehome Fund by \$4.1 million and 18.6 positions;
- Reduce programs supported by the Mobilehome Park Revolving Fund (Park Fund) by \$122,000 and 3.4 positions.

2009-10 Enacted Budget. Included the proposed expenditure adjustments, but not the TBL adjusting fee levels.

Staff Comments. This item was heard previously on April 23, 2009, and held open due to concerns that the Governor's proposal to decrease the number of mobilehome inspectors, while increasing fees, would result in residents and park owners paying more for less service. However, in the interim, the HCD has provided additional data to suggest that the drop-off in new construction inspections due to the declining real estate market has more than cancelled out the increase in complaint workload. Therefore, despite the proposed reduction of six inspectors, fee-payers should be able to anticipate service levels as least as high as 2006-07.

Staff notes no further concerns with this proposal at this time, but suggests that the Subcommittee may wish to consider requiring the HCD to track complaint response and resolution times in order to better inform future decisions about the number of inspectors required by this program.

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE as budgeted (including the proposed TBL).

VOTE:

2320 Department of Real Estate

A primary objective of the Department of Real Estate (DRE) is to protect the public in real estate transactions and provide related services to the real estate industry.

The Governor proposes \$45.3 million (no General Fund) in total expenditures and 336 positions for the Department – an increase of approximately \$600,000 and zero positions.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

1. BCP-2: Sacramento Headquarters Office Relocation. The DRE requests a one-time augmentation in the amount of \$1 million (one-time) to partially cover the estimated costs (\$1.3 to \$1.5 million) to relocate and consolidate its downtown Sacramento Headquarters Office and Examination Center at a new location. The requested funds would not only pay for moving expenses, but telephone and data expenses, supplies, and new modular furniture (estimated at \$1 million).

Staff Comments. This item was heard previously on April 23, 2009, and held open due to concern that the proposed increase in expenditures (\$1 million in budget year expenditures with an increase of at least \$1.5 million annually in the out years) would be imprudent at a time when there is already a significant imbalance between DRE revenues and expenditures. As staff noted at that time, even accounting for the department's plan to increase fees to their statutory maximum effective July 1, 2009, this proposal would put the DRE on course to spend approximately 25 percent more than it takes in over the next several years. Barring further action, the Real Estate Fund would become insolvent in fiscal year 2012-13 without the repayment of a \$10.7 million GF loan, which would only prolong insolvency an additional year or repaid.

While the DRE is currently conducting a comprehensive fee study in order to better align its fee levels with operational cost centers, there is insufficient information available at this time for staff to verify that the results of that study will enable the DRE to support the requested level of expenditures. Therefore, notwithstanding the DRE's justification for the need to relocate its HQ and its contention that acting now would allow the state to secure a low long-term lease in a soft commercial market, staff cannot recommend approval of additional deficit spending at this time. The Committee may wish to encourage the DRE to resubmit this request with a complete plan for addressing the Real Estate Fund condition with the 2010-11 Governor's Budget.

Staff Recommendation: DENY the request.

VOTE:

Appendix A – Employee Housing Program Scenarios (1 of 2)

# of Yrs between inspections	% of Housing Inspected	Annual Report .5=Yes 0=No	Monitor LEAs .5=Yes 0=No	Total # of Inspection DRs	Total # of DRs	Total # of PTs	Total # of PYs	Total Annual Cost of PYs	PTO Fee (current fee = \$35)	BL Fee (current fee = \$12)	Total Revenue Earned Annually	Difference of PY Costs and Revenue Earned
1*	75.00%	Yes	Yes	6.00	7.00	2	9.00	\$1,221,888	\$35	\$12	\$185,565	\$1,036,323
1	75.00%	Yes	Yes	6.00	7.00	2	9.00	\$1,221,888	\$900	\$58	\$1,223,580	-\$1,692
1	75.00%	No	No	6.00	6.00	1	7.00	\$984,854	\$500	\$54	\$988,140	-\$3,286
2	37.50%	Yes	Yes	3.00	4.00	1	5.00	\$685,726	\$335	\$38	\$687,825	-\$2,099
2	37.50%	No	No	3.00	3.00	1	4.00	\$536,162	\$300	\$29	\$544,740	-\$8,578
2	37.50%	No	Yes	3.00	3.50	1	4.50	\$610,944	\$325	\$33	\$612,555	-\$1,611
3	25.00%	Yes	Yes	2.00	3.00	1	4.00	\$536,162	\$300	\$29	\$544,740	-\$8,578
3	25.00%	No	No	2.00	2.00	1	3.00	\$386,598	\$150	\$23	\$392,730	-\$6,132
3	25.00%	No	Yes	2.00	2.50	1	3.50	\$461,380	\$200	\$27	\$471,720	-\$10,340
4	18.75%	Yes	Yes	1.50	2.50	1	3.50	\$461,380	\$200	\$27	\$471,720	-\$10,340
4	18.75%	No	No	1.50	1.50	1	2.50	\$311,816	\$150	\$18	\$321,930	-\$10,114
4	18.75%	No	Yes	1.50	2.00	1	3.00	\$386,598	\$150	\$23	\$392,730	-\$6,132

*Reflects historic staffing levels

Index

BL (Beds/Lots)	DR (District Representative)	LEA (Local Enforcement Agency)	PT (Program Technician)	PTO (Permit to Operate)	PY (Personnel Year)
----------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------